population is consuming 40 per cent resources of the world, I say that 10 per cent top population of this country is consuming more than 28 per cent of the resources of this country, whereas the other 10 per cent, the lowest ones, are getting just 3 per cent of it. That is what the World Bank Table says. But that will take time. With these words, today at least, I thank the hon. Members for giving me a patient hearing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Now, the Statement on the CTBT by the hon. External Affairs Minister.

[The Vice-Chairman Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi *In the Chair]*

STATEMENT BY MINISER

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Sir, this hon. House will recall that I had made two *suo motu* statements regarding the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on 15 & 31 July, setting out the Government's policy on this issue. The discussion that followed was indeed helpul and it represented a national consensus on this subject. This is reflected in the steps taken by the Government to continue to safeguard our national interests in the deliberations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Today, may I, with your permission, take this opportunity to brief the Honourable House on recent developments in Geneva.

As Hon'able Members are aware, the Government has been following a consistent and principled policy on nuclear disarmament and the CTBT. We have always considered that the CTBT should be the first definitive and irreversible step in the nuclear disarmament process. For this, it is necessary that the Treaty bring about an end to development and refinement of nuclear weapons in a comprehensive manner. It is also necessary that the Treaty be securely based within the nuclear disarmament framework by reflecting a commitment to the achievement of a nuclear weapon-free-world within a time bound framework.

Our approach during the negotiations was in keeping with this policy. In fact, the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee is clear — "to negotiate intensively a universal and multilaterally and effectively verifiable Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which would contribute effectively to prevention of prolifcration of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, to the process of nuclear disarmament and therefore to the enhancement of international peace and security". During the course of the negotiations, we found that the draft Treaty text was moving away from the mandate. Our proposals, put forward in a constructive spirit were in keeping with the mandate.

We are disappointed that the negotiations have been terminated prematurely and without consensus. The reason behind lack of consensus is clear - the desire of the nuclear weapon States to retain their nuclear hegemony. An artificial deadline was imposed and a flawed text was presented to the Ad hoc Committee. We stated and maintain that India cannot subscribe to such a draft. Not only did this text fall far short of the mandate. It also had other unacceptable features, particularly the formulation on Entry into Force in Article XIV. This formulation was suddenly introduced on 28 June after we had announced our decision not to subscribe to the draft text and withdrawn our stations from the International Monitoring System on 26 June. Hon'ble Members would recall that the Government has been firm and

unequivocal in stating that any language that would impose an obligation on India, directly or indirectly, either today or at a later date, would oblige us to indicate our opposition. Even though a large number of countries appreciated the logic of our position, the rigid position take by a small of nuclear weapon States prevented any change in this Article.

As a result, in keeping with out stated policy, we had to oppose the adoption of the draft Treaty text in the Ad hoc Committee. We also opposed the attachment of this draft Treaty text to the Report of the Ad hoc Committee, on the grounds that it is not a consensus text. On 16th August, the Ad hoc Committee adopted its Report without the draft Treaty text with the conclusion that "despite the assessments of (CD/NTB/WP330/Rev.2) contained in Section VI above and support for a proposal to transmit it to the Conference on Disarmament for its consideration, *no consensus could be reached either on the text or on the action proposed*". This Report was presented to the Conference on Disarmament and adopted by the Plenary on 20 August.

On 22 August, a large number of delegations suggested that this Report be transmitted to the present session (50th session) of the United Nations General Assembly which concludes on 16th September. After due consideration, we were obliged to point out that such a step was unnecessary because the Report did not have a consensus text accompanying it. Therefore, in our view, the Report would, in due course, as part of the Annual Report of the Conference on Disarmament, be transmitted to the 51st session of the UN General Assembly, scheduled to begin on 17th September, Thus, the move to transmit any special report was blocked by us. In taking these steps, we were guided by the national consensus and our commitment to safeguarding our national interests.

We are aware that many countries are determined to take the draft Treaty text to New York and have it opened for signature in September 1996. I would like to assure Hon'ble Members that the Government is monitoring these development and will take all necessary actions, consistent with our policy, to indicate our opposition to this text. At the same time, I would like to point out that unlike the Conference on Disarmament which takes decision by consensus, the UN General Assembly has its own rules of procedure. Nevertheless, we have position of principle which will be made known in this forum too.

Many countries with whom we hve close bilateral relations have adopted a position on this issue which is different from our stand, We have, through our dialogue, tried to explain the rationale for our position. We believe that agreement each other's vital national concerns is. We are committed to strengthening our relations with all countries remain confident that our differences on this issue will not affect out bilateral ties.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Hon. Members, I have got a list with me which contains seven names.

SHRI SUSHILKUMAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE (Maharashtra): Sir, I would also like to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I am afraid your name is not there.

SHRI SUSHILKUMAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE: Yes, Sir. My name is not there. But I would like my name to be included.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Your party is already represented. However, if time permits, I will allow you to speak. Now, Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): I take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation for the stand taken by our Ambassador at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. As the hon. Minister has very correctly pointed out, this is an issue on which there is a broad national consensus. On the earlier occasion when the hon. Minister made a *suo motu* statement on the floor of this House, we had the privilege of expressing our views in regard to the stand that we were going to take. It has been perfectly in consistence with the position that we have been taking for quite some time.

Now, the transmission of the Treaty to the 51st Session of the United Nations, as a part of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, has been effectively blocked and the CD has been effectively prevented from sending a special report to the current session of the United Nations. But as he himself has mentioned in the text of the statement, the United Nations has its own rules and there would be efforts —— as we find it from newspaper reports about the observations of many other countries —— to try to take it to the United Nations and according to his assessment, it would be difficult to say precisely what the course of action will be. But I would like to know what assessment the Minister of External Affairs is making of the likely course of action for its adoption in the United Nations and also as to what our strategy would be. Could you indicate some of the strategy that you are going to take? It is one thing to express our views. Of course, while participating in the debate, we will express our views and if they try to introduce it, we will propose amendments too. All those things are there. In the Conference on Disarmament, we had the advantage to veto it because the procedure requires a consensus. But in the United Nations, there may be a different procedure. This advantage may not be there.

The second aspect is much more important. We are fully aware that sometimes in private conversations our principled stand has been appreciated by some countries, not many. But there was hardly any supporter when the views were to be expressed in concrete terms. There have been some concerns expressed by some of our very close and friendly countries. It would now be our endeavour to convince them that the objective of our stand was not to spoil the game —— all of us are aware and it is, perhaps, difficult to appreciate the type of propaganda in the media that is going on against India by branding it as a spoiler of the game —— but to ensure our national security and till the last moment we tried to get our genuine concerns reflected in the Treaty because we had various options. What I mean to say is that a lot of lobbying through our friends and efforts at convincing others will have to be made, particularly those with whom we have very close relations. And this has to be done in the context of the next General Session of the United Nations because apart from being identified for having taken a particular position —— I am not using the word 'isolation' because I myself suggested at one point of time that on questions of basic principles, it is sometimes not undesirable to be isolated; but it is a fact that India has been identified as the single country that has vetoed the Treaty and ultimately it couldn't come out of the Conference on Disarmament—there is a need for explaining our stand to a large number of our friends so that they do not

share the view that has been expressed in the media in a very big way. And in the coming weeks, it is bound to be so—so that on other issues we are not confronted with difficult situations.

Thanking you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

DR. B.B. DUTTA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek certain clarifications from the hon. Minister.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Your mike is not working...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Yes, it is not working...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You be nearer to Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. That would serve the purpose.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Sir, one thing is very clear that the nuclear powers are determined to take the Draft to the United Nations General Assembly and get it passed. We are getting reports that they don't like to waste any time; if possible, they would like to have it tabled in the United Nations General Assembly as early as on 19th September, if I am correct.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: On the 9th September.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: They tried for 9th, but now they are fixing the date tentatively for 19th. That is how it is going on. My question is, if they take it to the General Assembly—we are sure, as availble indications are there, they would be able to get it passed—as the External Affairs Minister has said that the General Assembly has its own rules, and they will do it in spite of whatever veto power we exercised in the CD, where will India be? If out of all the nations of the world only two nations, namely, India and Iran are left out, if all other nations agree to pass it—remember we live in an age of democracy—then it becomes mandatory for all the nations. What will be our stand then? Should we say, no, we don't care for the United Nations General Assembly decision? Have we ever said like that in India? We were one of the chief supporters of the United Nations. We have fought for strengthening the United Nations. So, I feel that we are really facing a difficult task. The assumption was that if we apply our veto power in the CD, then because of that EIF clause it cannot be attached, to a special report to be sent to the General Assembly or it cannot be attached to the report of *ad hoc* Committee because it is not a consensus report and it cannot be passed. That was the assumption and that was why the veto power was exercised. Now the situation has radically changed. In this changed situation what should we do? There is a crisis.

I would like to point out some other developments. Last month, the International Court of Justice at Geneva in a historic judgement recommended that nuclear tests be banned. It also cited the examples that chemical weapons have been banned, biological weapons have been banned because their impact is terrible. Now, the Court has observed that no less terrible is the impact of nuclear tests and nuclear weapons; therefore, it should be banned. But, again there is an observation which is very disturbing. The Court, at the insistence of the nuclear powers and because of their objection, added that if any State at any point of time feels that its existence is going to be threatende, in that case, for defensive purposes, yes, it can use nuclear weapons. We should keep in mind that observation and observe what is happening in our neighbourhood. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of our External Affairs Minister, through you, to certain

disturbing developments. It is recally interesting to note the recent developments which are taking place and they are, I am very sure, quite disturbing from India's point of view.

China, all through the period of negotiations, has secured three main concessions. Throughout the negotiations, China exploded bombs, they tested them and showed that they have got all the advanced weaponry which has got a deterrant effect. That they have demonstrated. That is point number one.

Point number two is that all along China was insisting on peaceful nuclear explosion. Others did not agree. The U.S. did not agree. But what has happened later on? Very recently—I think, it is the development of the last two weeks—the U.S.A. has told France, "China may share from you our high-powered computer technology." From that they can test. Through that they can have simulation tests. That they have got and they will carry on with that.

Point number three is that China was opposed to on site verification. There was a startling development in the conference itself. The rule was that if any country conducts or attempts to conduct a nuclear test, then, by a simple vote of one-fourth of the C.D., on site inspection can be made. The major concession China secured in the C.D. itself was that after 9th August, when India applied its veto, the Chairman of the C.D., Mr. Jaap Ramaker, suddenly announced that in keeping with China's objection, I think it is high time and because they are bypassing sthe second part of the EIF which envisaged that it has to be a unanimous draft, we have an now, opportunity to review. And we must review. Now that they have violated this clause of unanimity. They are overruling it. They are taking it to the United Nations General Assembly. This gives us a handle for taking a major policy decision in the changed circumstances in the interest of this nation. We should not be found wanting. We should not lose a single day because they are harrying up so that we do not get time to revise our policy option. Some nations are angry with us and they want to teach us a lesson for that. I think it is high time that a very serious thinking was done on the entire CTBT stand taken by India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think it is because of the delicacy and complexity of the situation that the present External Affairs Minister and the former External Affairs Minister are exercising some caution. But, in any case, we are seeking clarifications. Shri John F. Fernandes.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Thank you, Sir. Mr.Vice-Chairman, I have to compliment the hon. Minister after the excellent performance by our Ambassador, Ms. Ghosh, at Geneva. I think the hon. Minister was the right person at the right time and at the right place to defend our stand of CTBT internationally. We have seen his performace at te ASEAN Conference and also the parleys he had with different foreign delegates, including the Secretary of State of US, Mr. Warren Christopher. I think we will weather the storm as we have weathered the storm of non-signing tyhe NPT.This Conference was held in 1994 and it was on Disarmament and the elite club of super powers threatened other countries. Ther were 61 countries in that Conference. But the club of the fve elite nuclear power countries diverted the main issue, that is, the issue of disarmament and got other countries involved in non-issues. Anbd this is one of the non-issues because they are not very serious and sincere.Sir, off and on, we read in this newspapers that there is going to be election in the United States

of America and across the Atlantic, that their leadership wants an election slogan and this country is being threatened with the sanctions. But, I do think that we give any credence to any threat because it is a sovereign nation, it is a sovereign country. Sir, the hon. Minister have mentioned that we have the veto at the Geneva Conference and the procedure in full two-thired vote would be required to carry our on site inspection.

There is another concession China has got. It has got two concessions. The demonstration they have made and they can continue to make. Now what is happening? China is passing on something to Pakistan. Pakistan, ten years back, had got a proven bomb design from China. They had carried out their tests without going in for physical test as we had done. It is not necessary for them. Now, Pakistan has got from China a missile factory. It is just completed. It took two years. Through this missile factory they will be able to produce missiles from next month which will have a range of 600 to 1,000 Kms. The areas Including New Delhi and Bombay, are going to be within the range of this missile.

And look, what is happening on our side? Our Agnitest was last conducted in 1994. After that there is no funding in spite of the hue and cry from the Standing Committee and the Consultative Committee on Defence and in the Parliament. Agni is stalled. No progress. I would put the question to the External Affairs Minister that in view of the developments in China and in Pakistan as also in keeping with the geo-politics of the area, whether India would not have any security threat because we are not going nuclear! They are hurrying up. I think, it is high time we took a radical and major decision. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was earlier the External Affairs Minister, he handled the matter himself. He knows too much. He has gone too deep into the matter. That is why he has spoken too little with changed accent. But, We common men also understand the reality. No Indian can be convinced to day about. What is going to happen to India's. We security are going in for a global economy, joining every global effort. But on this we are going to be isolated, totally outcast. The entire United Nations General Assembly is going to pass it. I do not understand this. I do not know how to reply to the people powers are instigating other countries, for example, Australia, to table this resolution at the United Nations. I do not know what steps the Minister has taken to pre-empt this resolution which is coming up there. Sir, the hon. Minister has not mentioned anything about whether there is any threat perception from these nuclear powers to have any economic sanctions on us. I do not know what sanction they speak of. The Finance Minister made some clarification in the Press, not in the Parliament. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister himself what the threat perception is that India is facing in case we stand firmly on our stand. I think the statement is very clear. Again the Minister has also mentioned that the procedure at the General Assembly is different from the procedure at Geneva. I do not know what he means by that procedure. Does it mean, by a majority vote? If the Minister clarifies these points, I will be very much obliged. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan. She is not here.

श्री रामगोपाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमान सेंकड वर्ल्ड वार के बाद संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के तत्वावधान में डिसआर्मामेंट के संबंध में कई प्रयास किए गए। लेकिन इन प्रयासों के बाद उसका उल्लंघन हुआ। चाहे वह न्यूक्लियर टेस्ट बैन ट्रीटी हो, चाहे वह नान-प्रोलिफिरेशन

ट्रीटी हो, चाहे वह स्ट्रैटिजिक आर्म्स लिमिटेशन ट्रीटी हो और चाहे वह स्ट्रैटिजिक आर्म्स रिडक्शन ट्रीटी हो, सब का वाइलेशन हुआ है। इससे सीखते हुए हिन्दुस्तान के प्रतिनिधि ने, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने जो सी०टी०बी०टी० पर जेनेवा में वीटो किया, यह एक प्रशंसनीय कदम है। लेकिन एक आशंका लोगों के मन में इस मसले पर उभर रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान को यू०एन० जनरल असेम्बली में आइसोलेट करने की कोशिश की जाएगी। जनरल असेम्बली में किसी को वीटो की पावर नहीं है, सेक्योरिटी कौंसिल में तो है और ये जो तीसरे विश्व के देश हैं उनकी वॉइस में भी वह दम नहीं रहा है और न वे इतने यूनाइटेड हैं-जो वे हिन्दुस्तान के साथ खड़े होकर जनरल असेम्बली में इस ट्रीटी के विरोध में वोट कर सकें। देश की जो परिस्थितियां हैं, हमारे अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ जो रिश्ते हैं, उनको देखते हुए यह जब अमल में आ जाएगा तो उससे हमारी सुरक्षा को वास्तविक खतरा पैदा हो जाएगा क्योंकि हमारे पड़ोसी देशों को और दूसरे देशों से न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स की भी मदद मिल सकती है और अन्य चीजों की भी सहायता मिलती रहेगी। प्रश्न यह है कि इस संधि के अमल में आ जाने की जब पूरी संभावना है तो हिन्दुस्तान अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए क्या रणनीति बनाएगा? जब मित्र देश आपकी मदद नहीं कर रहे हैं और पड़ोसी देशों के साथ आपके रिश्ते अच्छे नहीं है तो मैं चाहूंगा कि माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी जब अपना उत्तर दें तो थोड़ा सा इस पर भी अपनी स्पष्टीकरण दें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Shri K.R. Malkani.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to thank and congratulate the hon. Union Minister for External Affairs for the position that the Government has taken on CTBT. It is a matter of great satisfaction that there is national consensus on this issue. Except for a few voices which can only be described as those of 'Washington Patriots', I am sorry to say that, everybody else is agreed on this issue, all parties are agreed on this issue. But things are not going to stop here. Pressures are going to be applied on us. We already have a CIA here and now there is a proposal to open a branch of the FBI here. Nor is that all. Recently we brought some urea from Libya at a very economical price. We wanted to make payment for that. Our bank asked a certain Swiss bank to make the payment; that Swiss bank asked a certain American bank to make the payment and that American bank said, 'Nothing doing, we will not pass on this money to Libya' My question is: Why have we kept our foreign exchange with the Federal Reserve in the USA? For God's sake, please let the Government make the position abundantly clear.

It is not enough to say that our nuclear option is open. What is the point of having an option when you never avail of it? On the one hand, we say that our security situation is none too easy. China is known to be nuclear in a big way. Pakistan is only a screw-drive away from the nuclear bomb. What are we waiting for? Incidentally, for those who think in terms of money—although money should be irrelevant when it is a matter of national security—nuclear defence is much less expensive than conventional Defence. For God's sake, do not keep this option open indefinitely because infinite pressures are going to be applied against us.

My second point is — this is also a related matter: The Prime Minister in his Independence Day Address, said that we would go ahead with all our missile programmes—Prithvi, Agni, etc. Very good. I am very happy about it. Dr. Kalam, the DRDO Chief, has also said the same thing. But the hon. Minister for External Affairs says that we are not going ahead with the long-range missiles. Would he please clarify the position, because the hon. Prime Minister had named both, Prithvi and Agni. If We are not going nuclear, what are these Agni and Prithvi missile programmes for?

Sir, this is all I have to say. I hope the hon. Minister throws some light on these issues.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम (पश्चिमी बंगाल): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सब से पहले भारत के विदेश मंत्री और उनके मंत्रालय की टीम और खास कर के जिन लोगों ने नेगोसियेशंस में हमारे देश का प्रतिनिधित्व किया, उन सब को बधाई देता हूं। जो हमारे दूसरे साथियों ने कहा, मैं इस बात से सहमत हूं कि इस सवाल पर राष्ट्रीय सहमति बनी और हमें इस बात पर गर्व है कि यह सरकार इससे पहले दो अवसरों पर इस सवाल पर सदन में आई और मंत्री जी ने अपने बयान को यहां पर रखा। हम बराबर कह रहे थे कि चाहे राष्ट्रीय मुद्दा हो या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्दा हो सरकार जो फैसला करे उसके लिए पूरे राष्ट्र को, पूरे देश को और दोनों सदनों को विश्वास में ले और इस प्रक्रिया में हमारे मंत्री जी सफल हुए हैं। इसलिए आज सब उनके साथ हैं और उनको बधाई दे रहे हैं। इसी तरह से हम अपने राष्ट्र को, अपने देश को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर सम्मान के साथ और गौरव के साथ सिर उठा कर नेगोसियेशन करते हुए देखना चाहते हैं इस देश के हर नागरिक ने यह देखा है। पिछले पांच साल से हम यह कह रहे थे कि इस जगह पर थोड़ी कोताही हो रही थी, थोड़ी कमी महसूस हो रही थी, आज इस देश का हर नागरिक नीचे की सतह से ले कर ऊपर तक और इस सदन के लोग भी गौरवान्वित हैं जिस तरह से जेनेवा में इस सवाल पर हमारी सरकार ने फैसला किया है। लोग जानते हैं कि नेगोशियेटर कौन थे। पिछले जितने भी नेगोसियेशन हुए चाहे ट्रेड के हों, चाहे कामर्स के हों, चाहे अर्थ-नीति के हों या इस तरह के डिसआर्मामेंट के हों, अक्सर लोगों को नाम मालूम नहीं होगा कि कौन नेगोशियेट कर रहे थे। आज जो लोग इस देश की राजनीति की खबर भी नहीं रखते उनसे भी आप पूछेंगे तो वह बता देंगे कि कौन नेगोशियेट कर रहे थे। हमारे देश के लोगों की जो भावना है उसको सही ढंग से प्रतिबिम्बित करते हैं हमारे वार्तालाप में, हमारे फैसलों में तो उसका नतीजा यही होता है। इसलिए मैं आपको बधाई दे रहा हूं।

†[وزیر محمد سلیم "پشمی بنگال": اپ سبھا
اد صیکش مہودے - میں سب سے پہلے بھارت

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

کے ودیش منتری اور انکے منتراليہ کی ٹیم
اور خاص کر جن لوگوں نے نیگوسیئیشن میں
ہمارے دیش کا پرتی نودھتو کیا - ان سبکو
بدھائی دیتا ہوں - جو ہمارے دوسرے
ساتھیوں نے کہا ہے - میں اس بات سے
سہمت ہوں کہ اس سوال پر راشٹریہ
سہمتی بنی اور ہمیں اس بات پر فخر ہے -
کہ یہ سرکار اس سے پہلے دو موقعوں پر اس
سوال پر سدن میں آئی اور منتری جی نے
اپنے بیان کو یہاں پر رکھا - ہم برابر کہہ رہے
تھے کہ چاہے راشٹریہ مدا ہو - یا انتر راشٹریہ
مدا ہو سرکار جو فیصلہ کرے اسکے لئے پورے
راشٹر کو - پورے دیش کو اور دونوں سدنوں
کو وشواس میں لے - اور اس پرکریا میں
ہمارے منتری جی کامیاب ہوئے ہیں اسلئے
آج سب انکے ساتھ ہیں اور انکو بدھائی
دے رہے ہیں - اسی طرح سے ہم اپنے راشٹر
کو - اپنے دیش کو - انتر راشٹریہ منچوں
پر سمان کے ساتھ اور فخر کے ساتھ سر
اٹھا کر نیگو سیئیشن کرتے ہوئے دیکھنا چاہتے
ہیں اس دیش کے ہر ناگرک نے یہ دیکھا
ہے - پچھلے پانچ سال سے ہم یہ کہہ رہے تھے -
کہ اس جگہ پر تھوڑی کوتاہی ہو رہی تھی -

†[شری محمد سلیم: پرشن تو اتنے دنوں تک کرتے کرتے تھک گئے تھے اب پرشن کا کچھ آنند نکل کر آ رہا ہے۔]

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: He is in the Government now.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Suddenly he has realised that he is in the treasury benches.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: सुनिये, आप लोगों के अनुभव काम में आएगा, सदन में सुनने से अच्छा रहता है। जब यहां बैठते थे तब भी नहीं सुनते थे और अब वहां बैठे हैं तब भी नहीं सुनते हैं। कभी तो सुन लीजिये। (व्यवधान)

†[شری محمد سلیم: سنئے۔ آپ لوگوں کے انوبھو کام میں آئیگا۔ سدن میں سننے سے اچھا رہتا ہے۔ جب یہاں بیٹھتے تھے تب بھی نہیں سنتے تھے اور اب وہاں بیٹھے ہیں تب بھی نہیں سنتے ہیں۔ کبھی تو سن لیجئے۔ ... "مداخلت" ...]

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Salim, we have played both the roles. It is difficult for you.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: जैसे राष्ट्रीय सहमति के बारे में बाकी लोगों ने कहा, सी॰टी॰बी॰टी॰ के बारे में अब जो फैसला हुआ है, उसमें राष्ट्रीय सहमति है। इसका हमें गर्व है। एक थोड़ा सा औब्जेक्शन है खास कर के अभी मलकानी जी ने भी कहा लेकिन मैं और मेरी पार्टी यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि हम साउथ एशिया में न्युक्लियरेस ओपन करें। जिनके पास ताकत है, जो संक्षेप में कई राष्ट्रों की बात कही है जिनके पास न्युक्लियर ऑप्शन है। वह जिस तरह से हमें दबाव में रखना चाहते है, वह हमेशा यह चाहते रहे हैं कि दक्षिण एशिया और खास कर के हिन्द महासागर में इस तरह का एटमॉसफेयर

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

تھوڑی بھی محسوس ہو رہی تھی آج اس دیش کا ہر ناگرک نیچے کی سطح سے لیکر اوپر تک اور اس صدن کے لوگ بھی گروشت ہیں۔ جس طرح سے جنیوا میں اس سوال پر ہماری سرکار نے فیصلہ کیا ہے۔ لوگ جانتے ہیں کہ نیگو شیئیٹر کون تھے۔ پچھلے جتنے بھی نیگو سیشن ہوئے چاہے ٹریڈ کے ہوں چاہے کامرس کے ہوں۔ چاہے ایجوکیشن کے ہوں یا اس طرح کے ڈس آرمامینٹ کے ہوں۔ اکثر لوگوں کو نام معلوم نہیں ہوگا کہ کون نیگوشیٹ کر رہے تھے۔ آج جو لوگ اس دیش کی راجنیتی کی خبر بھی نہیں رکھتے ان سے آپ پوچھینگے تو وہ بتا دینگے کہ کون نیگوشیئیٹ کر رہے تھے۔ ہمارے دیش کے لوگوں کی جو بھاونا ہے اسکو صحیح ڈھنگ سے "پرتی نمبت" کرتے ہیں ہمارے وارتالاپ میں ہمارے فیصلوں میں تو اسکا نتیجہ یہی ہوتا ہے۔ اسلئے میں آپکو دوبارہ بدھائی دے رہا ہوں۔]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): आप प्रश्न पूछिये, बधाई तो बार-बार दे चुके हैं।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: प्रश्न तो इतने दिनों तक करते-करते थक गये थे। अब प्रश्न का कुछ आसार निकल कर आ रहा है।

क्रियेट किया जाए जिससे आर्म्स रेस में फस जाएं। लेकिन यह दबाव हमारे पास हो, देश के अन्दर भी हो और देश के बाहर से भी हो। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूं कि हमने जो फैसला लिया है, वेल एंड गुड, इसके बारे में जो शार्ट टर्म के बारे में आपने कहा कि यू०एन० जनरल अस्सेम्बली में जाएंगे। और उनके कुछ अपने कायदे कानून हैं। वहां कन्सेन्सस का सवाल नहीं है। रिजोल्यूशन अगर पास हो जाए तो हो जाए। आप खुद कह रहे हैं कि:—

A large number of countries appreciated the logic of our position.

वहां भी कहेंगे, उस फोरम का भी इस्तेमाल करेंगे। जो लोग आज हमको धमकी दे रहे हैं, दबाव डाल रहे हैं — कितने रिजोल्यूशंस पास हुए क्यूबा के बारे में यह हमने देखा और खुद अमेरिका उन रिजोल्यूशन्स को थोड़ी मानता था। इजरायल पर यू०एन० जनरल असेम्बली के कितने रिजोल्यूशंस लागू हुए? लेकिन हमें अपनी पोजीशन पर डटे रहना है। हमें यह कोशिश करनी पड़ेगी कि हमारे आजू बाजू के देश तीसरी दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्क हमारी खुद, अपनी पोजीशन में शामिल हों, और इसके बारे में एक कंप्रीहेंसिव और लांग टर्म एप्रोच होना चाहिए। उस कंप्रीहेंसिव का यही हिस्सा होना चाहिए। हम अगर इस तरीके से शार्ट टर्म गेन्स के बारे में अपना न्यूक्लियर आप्शन एप्लाई करते हैं तो फिर वह जो लांग टर्म पालिसी है, और जिस तरह से हमें डटे रहना है, दूसरे देशों को अपने साथ लेना है वह हम नहीं कर पाएंगे। इसलिए अपनी बात से थोड़ा हटकर जहां मलकानी जी का समर्थन नहीं हो सकता है वह बात कह रहा हूं। अब मंत्री महोदय सवाल है कि यू०एन० असेम्बली तक तो ठीक आपने कहा। लेकिन उसके बाद आने वाले 2, 3, 4, 5 साल में इस सब मामले में हम कोई एडहाकिज्म नहीं कर सकते हैं। तो सरकार को थोड़ा सोच विचार करना चाहिए। क्या आपके पास वह कंटिन्जेंसी प्लान, वह लांग टर्म प्लान मौजूद है जो आपकी मदद करेगा।

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

A large number of countries appreciated the logic of our position.

آنے والے دو تین چار پانچ سال میں اس سب معاملے میں ہم کوئی اڈھمائزم نہیں کر سکتے ہیں - تو سرکار کو تھوڑا سوچ بچار کرنا چاہیے کیا آپ کے پاس وہ کنٹیجنسی پلان وہ لانگ ٹرم پلان موجود ہے - جو آپکی مدد کریگا -]

"ختم شد"

†[وہاں بھی کہینگے اس ہتھیار کا بھی استعمال کرینگے - جو لوگ آج ہمکو دھمکی دے رہے ہیں - دباؤ ڈال رہے ہیں - لکھنے ڈرو یو شنس پاس ہوئے - لیکھا کے بارے میں یہ ہم نے دیکھا اور خود امریکہ ان ڈرو یو شنس کو تھوڑا ہی مانتا ہے - اسرائیل پر یو - این - جنرل اسمبلی کے کتنے ڈرو یو شن لاگو ہوئے - لیکن ہمیں اپنی پوزیشن پر ڈٹے رہنا ہے ہمیں یہ کوشش کرنی پڑیگی کہ آزو بازو کے دیش - تیسری دنیا کے دوسرے ملک ہماری خود اپنی پوزیشن میں شامل ہوں اور اسکے بارے میں ایک کمپری ھینسو اور لانگ ٹرم اپیروچ ہونا چاہیے - اس کمپری ھینسو کا یہی حصہ ہونا چاہیے - ہم اگر اس طریقہ سے شارٹ ٹرم گینس کے بارے میں اینا نیو کلیر آپشن اپلائی کرتے ہیں تو پھر وہ جو لانگ ٹرم پالیسی ہے - اور جس طرح سے ہمیں ڈٹے رہنا ہے - دوسرے دیشوں کو اپنے ساتھ لینا ہے - وہ ہم نہیں کر پائینگے - اسلئے اپنی بات سے تھوڑا ہٹ کر جہاں ملکانی جی کا سمرتھن نہیں ہو سکتا ہے وہ بات کہہ رہا ہوں اب منتری مہودے سے سوال ہے - کہ یو این اسمبلی تک تو ٹھیک آپنے کہا لیکن اسکے بعد

†[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): मेरा यह सबसे अनुरोध है, चूंकि मंत्री जी को उत्तर भी देना है और हम 6 बजे एडजर्न होते हैं इस वजह से संक्षेप में थोड़ा सा कहें। श्री शिन्दे।

श्री सुशील कुमार संभाजीराव शिन्दे : महोदय, प्रथमतः मैं मंत्री महोदय का अभिनन्दन करना चाहता हूं। आज एक ऐसी सरकार है जिसको 13 पार्टियां समर्थन दे रही हैं और ऐसे वक्त में एक ऐसा इश्यू आ गया है जिसमें एन०पी०टी० से समर्थन की बातें चल रही थीं। भारतवर्ष की सभी जनता को आज इतना आनंद होता है कि भारत पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की जो पालिसी थी, फिलासाफी थी उसी रास्ते पर चलता आ रहा है। to withstand the pressure from all those mighty nations. जैसे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स की पालिसी है, फिलासाफी है वैसे ही डिफेंस की भी पालिसी इक्ट्ठी हो जाती है। यदि एक जगह कहीं गलती हो जाए तो देश की सिक्योरिटी दिक्कत में आ जाती है। आज जब चाइना एम-11 मिसाइल्स पाकिस्तान को देता है तब हम यह स्टैंड ले रहे हैं दुनिया में यह स्टैंड ले रहे हैं कि भारत सी०टी०बी०टी० पर साइन नहीं कर सकता है। तो ऐसे वक्त में यह दबाव डालने का काम होता है और इस सरकार ने जो काम किया है उससे भारत को समर्थवान बनाया है और बनाना चाहती है। मैं इसी के लिए आपका अभिनन्दन करना चाहता हूं। यह जरूरी था कि हम समर्थवान और समर्थशील बनें। जब समर्थवान और समर्थशील बनते हैं तो यह हमारी एक जिम्मेदारी होती है। मुझे यह पता है और मंत्री जी को भी पूरा पता है कि उन्होंने जिस तरह से स्टैंड लिया है यह बहुत अभिनन्दनीय है कल सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में जो हमारा बर्थ आने वाला है उस

वक्त क्या दिक्कतें आ सकती हैं, उसका भी विजन उनके सामने है। उस पर भी मैं ज्यादा भाष्य नहीं करना चाहता हूं। यह देखते हुए भी इस तरह का समर्थनीय विचार रखना और भारत का टस से मस नहीं होना मैं समझता हूं कि यही स्वतंत्रता हासिल करने के बाद भारत को समर्थ बनाने की ताकत हमें देता है। यह एक अच्छा रास्ता है इसलिए मैं एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं, ज्यादा सवाल नहीं करूंगा कि आज हमने यह स्टैंड लिया है लेकिन आगे आने वाले तीन साल में हम किस तरफ बढ़ावा लेकर जा रहे हैं। इसका जिक्र मेरे साथी ने भी किया कि हमारी स्ट्रेटेजी आगे क्या होने वाली है और जब तक हम यह स्ट्रेटेजी नहीं करेंगे तब तक केवल इस तरह की घोषणाओं का उपयोग नहीं होने वाला है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय जो कि बहुत अनुभवी हैं और इस अनुभव के सहारे आगे आने वाले साल के लिए एक अच्छी स्ट्रेटेजी बनाकर इस देश को और समर्थशील बनायेंगे। इसलिए आगे क्या स्ट्रेटेजी रहने वाली है वह यह भी बताएं यही मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, thank you very much. I will not repeat any of the points but will only seek one or two clarifications.

To start with, I would like to congratulate the Government of India and the External Affairs Minister and his team who have done a wonderful job in resisting the pressure from many powerful countries and not signing the CTBT. I know that in the CTBT situation we were isolated—just one or two countries were with us. What the hon. Minister has said is that the effort is going to be to take it to the UN where obviously, again, a similar situation would be there. Now my suggestion to the hon. Minister is that firstly we should try to see if we can rope in other countries saying that it was the precondition that this has to be passed unanimously before it can be taken to the UN. Now, if this is going to be violated, in that particular UN body should we participate and allow this to be debated, discussed and passed, whatever?

If we are able to rope in some other countries saying that this is in violation of that and it has nothing to do with the principle, then, probably, instead of two, three countries we may have four, five or six, seven countries—whatever number we can rope in. Assuming that we are not able to rope in enough countries and we are isolated like in Geneva where only two countries were there, then should we not declare today itself that we are not going to participate in a session which we consider as an illegal session and unless this matter is sorted out first, we are not going to participate? This is my view. Can I make a suggestion to the External Affairs Minister?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Please address the Chair because the Minister will have to reply.

SHRI SANJAY DALMIA: I feel that we should declare today itself that if this going to be violated, if the initial understanding is going to be violated, we are not going to participate in a thing which is not legal as per the understanding in Geneva.

Sir, these are the two, three things which I wanted to bring to your notice. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Now, the hon. Minister.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: (Karnataka) Sir, my name is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I am afraid, your name is not here.

...(Interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The lady should be allowed.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Sir, she is the only lady in the House.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): गया सिंह जी भी है उसके बाद फिर यह है कि थोड़ा सा मंत्री महोदय को भी उत्तर देने के लिए पूरा समय मिलना चाहिए।

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: मारग्रेट थैचर के बाद तो मारग्रेट आल्वा ही है।

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Sir, I am not going to make any speech because most of the points have already been made. But I do wish to congratulate the Government on the very clear stand they have taken and, especially, our Ambassador at the disarmament conference, Arundhati Ghosh. I think on this issue there is, undoubtedly, a national consensus and everyone stands with the Government on the stand which we have taken on this issue. But, as has been expressed by my colleagues, there is a certain feeling of isolation which has emerged in the course of the negotiations and in the developments which have taken place. Not that one has to be afraid, but I think one has to be prepared and some kind of a strategy, national, has to be worked out to break into the opinion leaders forums—not just of the so-called Super Powers. I think India has long-standing friends in forums at which India has played a leading role. And what worries me today is that none of these forums have been activated to stand by us, whether it is the Non-Aligned group though I know that non-alignment is not a very stylish or popular word either with the External Affairs Ministry or with the others these days—or others. But I think that long-standing commitments and friendship of groups with whom we have stood, whether in Africa or in the developing countries, have got to be activated to be able to stand by us in the United Nations. Most often it is to us that other countries have turned to set the tone and, if I may say so, to give the lead so that the voice of the underdeveloped/developing countries could really be heard in the United Nations. I feel that we have a special responsibility to activate these fora and to see that our stand is understood, is appreciated and is accepted. Russia has made a statement appreciating our stand.

Isolated countries are now making statements saying that they appreciate India's stand. Yet, when it actually came to negotiations at Geneva, nobody really spoke out, though Iran and one or two other countries did express their views categorically. Threfore, I would like to ask of the hon. Minister whether he is clear that pressures, particularly on the economic front, whether overt or covert, would not be brought on India. We already see what is happening in the neighbouring countries. It has been mentioned that assistance is coming from China to our neighbouring country. Arms are arriving in Pakistan from the U.S. "THE WASHINGTON POST" report has made many facts clear, and they are before us. Therefore, I want to ask the hon. Minister whether he has in mind a consistent compaign, through which many of the capitals can be approached directly, our point of view made clear to them and their assistance sought.

Sir, today it is not just the United Nations fora and it is not just arms and nuclear power that one is concerned about. With the liberalisation of our economic policy and with our increasing dependence on foreign capital which is coming, various levers will begin to operate to create problems even in our developmental field and in our economic programmes. Therefore, I would like to ask of the hon. Minister to clarify this. He has been speaking to a number of people, I know, including those in the US, in Asia and in many other countries. He has made very clear to them what we stand for. But are their responses really such that give you confidence that we will be able to go through the United Nations

General Assembly session this time without too many problems for and without any embarrassment to us?

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you.

Before I call upon Mr. Gaya Singh to seek his clarifications, I think, I have to be fair to the hon. Minister. We must extend the time of the House till he finishes his reply. So, it is agreed. I will not say 6-15 p.m. or 6-30 p.m.

Shri Gaya Singh.

श्री गया सिंह (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद आपने मुझे समय दिया।

सबसे पहले मैं भी मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूं कि इस सरकार के विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से इन्होंने अपनी इच्छा और शक्ति देश के आवाम की इच्छा के साथ बड़ी बहादुरी के साथ प्रकट की है। मैं शिंदे जी से सहमत हूं कि देश में जवाहर लाल नेहरू के जमाने से जो हमारी विदेश नीति चली आ रही थी, उस में बीच में कुछ आर्थिक कारणों से और उदारीकरण के चक्कर में थोड़ी-बहुत ढील आ गयी थी, लेकिन इस सरकार के विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से जो साफ-साफ नीति उन लोगों के सामने रखी है, उस के लिए वह प्रशंसा के पात्र हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल एक ही सवाल और क्लैरीफिकेशन चाहता हूं कि अभी तक वह जो कुछ कर रहे हैं, उस की प्रशंसा इस हाउस में और पूरे देश में हो रही है, लेकिन अब जो आने वाले दो सप्ताह हैं, वह बहुत ही क्रिटीकल हैं और उस मौके पर चारों तरफ से दबाव आएगा। मीडिया का ऑलरेडी प्रचार शुरू हो गया है। ऐसी स्थिति में एक तो मीडिया का दबाव और अभी जैसा कि आल्वा मैडम कह रही थीं, मैं उन से सहमत हूं कि हमारे जो कुछ फ्रेंडली कंट्रीज और ग्रुप है इन दो सप्ताह के अंदर उन से संपर्क और बढ़ाया जाए। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि बायकॉट करने का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि हमारी नीति को हम वहां जाकर भी उतनी ही ताकत के साथ कुछ दोस्तों को साथ लेकर रखें। फिर वोट में हार जाए या जीत जाएं, वह बात अलग है, लेकिन उसे वहां रखने की हम कोशिश करें। आज रशिया का स्टेटमेंट था और सोवियत यूनियन के कई दूसरे देशों के भी कुछ अलग-अलग स्टेटमेंट्स आ रहे हैं। अभी हमारे मित्र ने कहा कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका तथा और लोगों के साथ हमारी लॉबिंग हो। तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि जो एफॉर्ट्स आप ने जेनेवा में किए, आनेवाले दो सप्ताहों में उसी किस रूप में आप रखेंगे? इस बारे में आप की क्या स्टेटेजी होगी ताकि इस देश के आवाम की जो भावना है, उस को हम वहां बहुत बहादुरी के साथ रख सकें और हमारी जो पुरानी परंपरा है, उसे आगे लेकर चल सकें? इस में डरने की जरूरत नहीं है और घबराने की जरूरत नहीं है।

इस हाउस का और दोनों हाउस का आप को सपोर्ट मिल रहा है और जो आवाम की इच्छा है, उसे आप आगे बढ़ाएंगे, ऐसा हमें भरोसा है। इसी संबंध में मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानकारी चाहूंगा।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me begin by saying that I feel very grateful and humble for the type of views that have been expressed by my colleagues in appreciating the efforts of the Government and my Ministry. It is not to my credit; nor to the credit of the Ministry alone. I think, it is ultimately a compliment to the nation's unity that we have been able to stand up together. I must in all humility express my view that it is the support from all sections of the House that has given us strength and also the courage to withstand the pressures. Therefore, in all humility, I would say again that I am grateful because some work that we have done has been recognised. But, at the same time, I would like to say that my head bows in all humility before this nation and before this House, which has realised and appreciated what the nation's interests are and how they are to be safeguarded. For this, I am very greateful.

I must also say at the same time that the situation that is emerging, and that has emerged, is something that we are all

conscious of. It is not only the Ministry of External Affairs, it is not only myself personally, but, I think, it is a very interesting dimension of Indian polity that on all international issues this nation is so conscious and so much aware of the implications on various issues.

My friends have made very worthwhile suggestions. In my own humble way I will try to respond to whatever I can and as I perceive the situation to come. What is to come? What is to come is something which ultimately naturaly no one can precisely state. Nor should I be asked to spell out the strategy of our responses. And I have said it at one other forum, Sir, that we will cross the bridge when we come to it. I think that was a very pregnant statement that I made. And I repeat that. The Session will be held on the 9th. What will happen there? Well, I can assure you one thing and that is that we will not let you down. That is the only assurance I can give you this time.

There will be media propaganda. Media propaganda is coming from outside. And now, in the modern sense, when the electronic media has become so powerful, I think that is where the response cannot come from the Government alone. The response can come from all of us together that we would not let an atmosphere prevail in the country that the media, be insider or outsider, can cause confusion in our minds. After all, all along our life we have seen that the media is an instrument of war and also an instrument of strategy. Therefore, we are all conscious that within our own respective parties, within our own followings, we shall not let any side prevail, which causes doubts on the Government to begin with, and alao let the enemy succeed in confusing us. If we all discharge that responsibility, I am sure nothing will happen. This is something which the Government also cannot do. And I do not undertake the responsibility that I can do. I would, therefore, feel that collectively we can do. I think the collective will of the house will see to it, whether it be a propaganda coming from outside via transmitter and cable programmes or whether it be programmes made by some local people who may get confused sometimes in all honesty, there the responsibility must come from you in expressions and in writing and in speaking. The House will adjourn soon, Sir, and we will go back to our constituencies and States. That is where, I think, we can convey our message.

My friends have rightly pointed out — and I endorse — that the strength of the Indian Foreign Policy is that we have a tradition, that we have a legacy; and that legacy and tradition began in the freedom struggle. We have learnt during the freedom struggle and the 50 years of our Republic has taught us what our foreign policy should be and what it has been. The credit for its 6.00 P.M. authorship goes to the great Nehru and I bow my head in all humility to that great person. It is not a question of which party he belonged to. It is not a question of which party he led. He lad a nation. In leading the nation he also built the institution of Non-Aligned Movement on the one side and various other international fora, on the other side, which we are talking about. He did one thing more which I think, is very important for us. He educated the entire nation about the implications of foreign policy. He turned every public meeting into a study circle and educated the people. I think that is something which we have to do during election campaigns or during non-election campaigns. We also have to educate our nation to inform them what is going to happen.

Sir, my friends have talked about isolation. It should not worry us. It is not the first time that we are being threatened in

the name of isolation. It happened in the past also when we took a stand regarding Vietnam. At that time we were isolated. When we took a stand regarding Afghanistan, we were isolated. More than anything else, when we took our stand on Bangladesh, we were isolated. That isolation never determined India's foreign policy nor were we ever influenced by that. India's foreign policy basically has been and would continue to be a very ruthless analysis of our national interest. Having understood that, having carried the nation on that, once the nation is carried, once the nation supports, then every resolution can be understood and we can withstand it. There is no danger on that. We are now a nation of 97 crores of people. I think that has been the figure of yesterday. Can anybody, in the world, isolate a nation of 97 crores of people? Now, today we are in a different fashion.

Some friends have talked about the economic isolation. Which type of economic isolation? Ours is not a nation which depends for its food on anybody. It is not a nation which depends for its industrial growth on anybody. It is not a nation — I think we have repeatedly said — which is dependent on anybody for its defence production. We have done everything on our own. We have shown to others that we can do it. If need be, we can do it again. Don't ask me to spell it out as to what we shall do. But I can assure you one thing, that whatever steps we take, we would keep the House informed and would take the House into confidence and would carry the nation with us. We shall not do anything in secrecy. We shall not do anything for which we can't face the nation. Transparency is not only in the sphere of integrity, but it is also there in the entire nation collectively. The nation knows what it stands for and what it is going to do. Therefore, let this propaganda not succeed. Those who are trying to really terrify us or make us nervous on the isolation matter should know what isolation is.

My friends have rightly mentioned about Cuba. On isolation, Cuba showed how it could withstand it. Vietnam — the glory of vietnam — could withstand on isolation. We are a far mightier nation than those countries. We are a far larger nation than those countries. We are a nation with a far larger legacy and a proud legacy than those countries. So, I am not worried about that. Some questions were raised: "What would happen in the United Nations? Would a resolution come?" Yes, it would come. We would present our point of view with all the force at our command. We are also trying to persuade our friends to see our point of view. But, is it the first time that a United Nations resolution is going to be passed? Wasn't a resolution passed regarding Bangladesh? How many resolutions have been passed against Israel? I can go on repeating the long history about which my friend. Mrs. Margaret, also mentioned. But I would not take your time to do so. For God's sake, let not such a propaganda sap our energy or our morale. This is something which we would never take. Once you know this thing, once our adversaries also know, that first we know to defend ourselves and secondly in the hour of difficulty, we also know how to take it in our stride. what sanctions will come? I do not want to challenge anybody. It is not my salt top try to be a confrontationist. In all humility I would say that those who think in terms of economic stability would be forced to take a second thought. In their second thought they know where things are.

I think the other issue which had been raised here is whether we are able to look after our foreign exchange position or not. In the hour of crisis, this nation also knows how to guard its life-lines. We

have a tradition, we have a history, we have a legacy and that is that we can withstand all difficulties, if need be. And I do not think any Indian, much less this House, hon. House, will ever get demoralised because somebody might say, "We are not going to sell coca-cola to you." Nor do I think that somebody will say any day, "We will stop supplies". Some friends have talked about weapons, what weapons we should have. Weapons are a response. Weapons are not something which we can think in abstract. Weapons respond to a situation. Weapons respond to the assessment of a threat. Weapons respond to a situation that we see coming. I will not go into details. I can only tell you two things. We are aware of what is happening around us. We are not being taken by surprise. Newspapers might write today what we knew yesterday. Therefore, please be very sure. And I can guarantee this thing to this House. The security of India, under no circumstances, shall be compromised. And, therefore, I can also tell you one thing. that is, whether you make weapon 'A' or whatever name it is called, whether it is nuclear or non-nuclear, whether it is traditional or non-traditional, whether it is mounted on a gun or on a tank, all these the strategists will decide. And the Government, politically, will back them up. The Government will never let down our scientists. The Government will never let down our strategists. the Government will never let down our defence forces. This is one thing I can assure you of and I think we will stand by them.

On whether the membership of the Security Council will be threatened or not threatened, I must say, with humility, that I will take all this in its stride. Ultimately, when you have made up your mind, when the nation has made up its mind that it is not going to compromise on such issues, then, whatever comes in our way, we will take and we will take it with dignity. We will not let anybody divide us. We will not let anybody split us. And we will not let anybody confuse us. On whether we will boycott or not, I do not think boycott has ever been our strategy. We are always in favour of a democratic discussion in the United Nations. We have always done it. We have never shirked. We have always behaved with dignity there also. I think in the 50 years of the Indian Republic, there are incidents after incidents when people differed with us. But we lost neither our balance nor our poise nor our dignity. We will not lose any of them and yet we will go on saying our point of view with all remarkable clarity.

Well, I have been asked whether this nation has confidence or not. I have great faith in this nation. I am one of those lucky members of that generation which participated in the freedom struggle. And my legacy, my entire attitude, is determined by the freedom struggle. We took on a mighty nation. What were we in 1947? We stood up. And in 1996, we are a nation which nobody can ignore and nobody shall be allowed to ignore. Therefore, I urge upon you all with humility. Do not ask me details on these issues. But please continue the solidarity. Please sustain the unanimity. And please go on backing the policy and wherever you think I am going wrong, you are most welcome to tell me where I should correct. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at eight minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 27th August, 1996.